DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 416 911 JC 980 111

AUTHOR Allison, Robert D.
TITLE Faculty Obligations and Compensation: The Necessity of a New Approach. Revised.
PUB DATE 1998-01-21
NOTE 26p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; College Planning; Community Colleges; *Compensation (Remuneration); Computer Managed Instruction; Educational Administration; Educational Change; *Faculty College Relationship; *Faculty Development; *Faculty Workload; Job Analysis; Outcomes of Education; *Teacher Role; Technology Education; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

As faculty continue to incorporate new technology into their teaching strategies, a new approach becomes necessary for determining instructor responsibilities and compensation. New faculty roles and obligations must amend traditional teaching duties, and the basis upon which teachers are compensated should change as well. Agreements, clarifying updated job descriptions, must be created by both faculty and administration in a collaborative effort. The number of units of instruction should be determined by an assignment index based on learning outcomes rather than a particular number of hours spent by a faculty member in the classroom. In addition, greater workload credit might be warranted for particularly difficult or new subject matter and/or technology, or if the faculty member is responsible for physical resources. Course management and type of instruction should be critical factors in determining faculty assignment, as should the number of students and remote sites, since more students and sites mean additional responsibility for the instructor. Contains tables of an example system utilizing the above criteria. (YKH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 416 911

Faculty Obligations and Compensation: The Necessity of a New Approach

Robert D. Allison

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
R. Allison
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

JC 980 111

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Faculty Obligations and Compensation: The Necessity of a New Approach

Robert D. Allison

(Revised January 21, 1998)

Instructional technology appears to gaining ever increasing momentum today. Computers are used at various levels of intensity in the teaching of virtually all disciplines. Distance education as a mode of delivering instructional programs is growing apace. The most recent innovation in providing instruction, use of the Internet, is being promoted with great enthusiasm by educators and political leaders alike. Indeed, virtual universities are springing up at a rate greater than the traditional brick and mortar types ever did. With all of the discussion about these exciting new developments, there has been little comment and less in-depth analysis regarding the obligations and compensation of the higher education faculty who are being expected to create and implement instructional materials using these technologies. In this chapter, we will review some current practices and suggest that a new approach now may be necessary.

Current Practices

Practices for determining faculty compensation[1] and obligations are numerous, not all of which are equally suitable for learning environments in which instructional technology plays a major role. In the following, some of these practices will be discussed.

Faculty Compensation Inadequate compensation frequently has been cited as a barrier to greater faculty interest in adopting new instructional technologies (Olcott and Wright, 1995). Institutions have attempted to address this issue both directly and indirectly, as follows.

---

[1] **Compensation** refers to any remuneration received by faculty for their services. Some common examples include monetary stipends, assigned (or released) time, and additional contract days.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The most direct of the traditional approaches includes stipends, assigned time, and additional contract days. Stipends are the most commonly used methods to compensate faculty for defined responsibilities considered to be outside the scope of their usual roles. These may include such activities as:

- Development of technology-based courses, such as Internet classes.
- Acting as a team leader in the development of new curriculum, the implementation of a new application of instructional technology, or research into the role of technology in the instruction of a particular course or body of knowledge.
- Assisting other faculty in the application of instructional technology to their disciplines.

Assigned time (sometimes referred to as release time) can be used as a substitute for monetary compensation or as an adjunct to it. For longer projects or for continuing duties such as coordinating a program, a certain amount of time can become regularly assigned as a portion of a faculty member's duties. Frequently faculty prefer assigned time to monetary compensation. This is a sensible position. Since regular faculty duties are considered to constitute a full time occupation, it flies in the face of logic to also expect quality work when additional, demanding responsibilities are added to this job. The provision of additional compensation does not change the fact that the number of hours in a day is fixed.

Additional contract days resulting in the extension of the usual 10-month faculty contract into the summer or other "non-contract" times sometimes is justified on the same basis as assigned time.

Some methods of "compensation" are indirect. Encouragement by colleagues or administrators certainly is an important factor in motivating faculty. However, it will not generally work well as a sole method of compensation, except, possibly, for a limited amount of time. Awards and recognition also should be part of all institutional practices, but, like administrative encouragement, cannot and should not be thought of as

compensation. The need for faculty training often is cited as critical to the success of technological innovations. Some aspects of staff development, particularly when funds are provided for conference attendance, also function as reward mechanisms. Although staff development is indeed necessary and often rewarding in a number of ways, it is, again, not truly compensation.

It should be evident that all approaches to compensation, whether direct or indirect, will be successful as motivating factors only when clear understandings regarding faculty obligations and expectations exist. This issue is discussed in the next section.

Faculty Obligations and Expectations Faculty teaching obligations and expectations are derived from two major sources: what the institution expects from its faculty and what the faculty expect from themselves. Most faculty experienced traditional, lecture-based education. Since generally we teach as we have been taught, it is not surprising that the vast majority of higher education faculty use the lecture as their primary teaching methodology, sometimes accompanying it with various levels of technology, from overhead projectors to multimedia. Many if not most faculty set their own expectations as teachers in terms of the lecture or lecture - discussion. Indeed, most see themselves as excellent lecturers and frequently use the lecture method as the standard of excellence against which other methods are compared, often unfavorably. Certainly the traditional view has the teacher as the central focus of the teaching/learning process. For example, John McFarland quotes computer engineer Clifford Stoll as follows: "Name three film strips that had a lasting effect on your life. Now - name three teachers." Clearly, some faculty do not see any need to adopt "non-traditional" instructional methods.

Indeed, since it is their position that the teacher is the key factor in any instructional setting, methods that appear to diminish the teacher's role are likely to be seen as inferior, cost-saving substitutes (or fads) primarily promoted by administrators. Certainly these faculty do not see themselves as obligated to adopt new technologies in their teaching.

Some institutions may simply expect faculty to be good traditional teachers. In other cases, faculty may be expected to employ the most effective methods (technological or not), teach at non-traditional times and places, and adjust their teaching and curriculum to the specific needs of their students. How such expectations are communicated include:

Job description/announcement A job description should clearly set out the expectations of the position. If a job is new or being filled with a new person, such expectations should be in the position announcement. As technology and/or student needs change, it may be necessary to modify current job descriptions. This might require changes in a collective bargaining agreement and be subject to negotiations.

Administrative communications Department chairs and other administrators usually convey their expectations to faculty, particularly new faculty. This takes many forms, from beginning of the year pep talks to statements in faculty handbooks to college newsletters.

Evaluations One of the ways we communicate what is important is through the evaluation process. If we really believe that new approaches to instruction are valuable, we will evaluate on how well they are being implemented. Clearly, this must be supported by appropriate understandings between the institution and faculty, including, if applicable, collective bargaining agreements, as well as an institutional culture that supports instructional innovation.

Faculty contract and/or handbook Most faculty collective bargaining contracts and handbooks include a list of duties and/or expectations. These may include responsibility for employing technology in teaching and student services.

Institutional culture An institutional culture which encourages and supports innovation and tolerates failure is essential if true innovation and experimentation is to take place on meaningful scale. Not only must administrators talk about their expectations, they must provide the necessary support structures. No list of faculty duties, contractual language,

or even evaluations will work very well without such support.

In current practice, then, compensation is based on a traditional model of faculty service. Although faculty generally are expected to engage in curriculum work and program development, in-depth use of technology and the development of non-traditional delivery of instruction usually are considered extra duties and are compensated as such. Faculty obligations are seen in a similar manner by both faculty and administrators.

A New Approach

It is becoming clear that the community college - indeed, all of higher education - is undergoing profound changes. Some of these changes include:

- A vast increase in the number of students seeking post-secondary education. This increase expected to exceed 1 million students in California alone over the next decade.
- Technology, which has affected not only how we teach but, in some disciplines, what we teach as well. Technologies such as interactive television and the Internet have released (or have the potential to release) our instructional programs from the place - bound, time - bound, efficiency-bound, and role-bound (O'Banion, 1997) constraints under which it previously labored.
- Increasing student diversity, as our student populations come to reflect more closely the compositions of our communities. This not only means greater ethnic variety, it tells us that we can no longer assume that the learning styles of all or even most of our students will be matched to the traditional lecture mode of instruction.
- Greater emphasis on workplace skills. We must not only teach our subject matter but also other, generic skills, such as how to function as an effective member of a workplace team.

These developments do not mean that the traditional methods of instruction will disappear, nor should they. The lecture, for example, is a powerful and proven medium and often can be made more effective through the use of technology. For example, the

experience at Bakersfield College has shown large enrollment lecture classes supplemented with multimedia presentations to be both very effective and popular with students. However, it also is clear that new technologies and new approaches to instruction are necessary if we are to reach the increasing number of students who require higher education but for various reasons cannot become traditional students.

{KAMALA THINKS WE NEED MORE SUPPORTING STUFF HERE.}

New Faculty Roles, Obligations, and Expectations

Currently the process of learning is the subject of increased scrutiny in higher education. Terry O'Banion has called for the establishment of "learning colleges" and D. Bruce Johnstone has stated that we must increase "learning productivity" by emphasizing learning while excluding other, less productive student activities (Johnstone, 1992; Barr and Tagg, 1995; O'Banion, 1997). With this emphasis, along with the advent of powerful new tools which can be effectively applied to the learning process, faculty members will be expected to assume a number of roles in addition to or even instead of the traditional major function of subject matter expert and transmitter. (The role which some have termed "the sage on the stage." O'Banion, 1997) These roles include curriculum designer, learning facilitator, and technology manager, among others (Beaudoin, 1990; Johnstone, 1992; Barr and Tagg, 1995). Barr and Tagg see faculty as "designers of learning methods and environments" in which "faculty and students work in teams with each other and other staff." Faculty will be responsible for organizing instructional resources so that students will be able to engage in effective independent study and serve as an "intermediary between students and available resources" (Ocott and Wright, 1995). Thus, it will be necessary for faculty to not only know their subjects well, but also be expert in using technology to design learning environments for their students, some of whom may be many miles away while they are taking the course. Indeed, the concept of the "course" as it is now known may disappear, to be replaced by other learning formats

which are neither time or place - bound. Just as important, it will be necessary for the faculty member to know the kind of the technology, including "low technology," is most appropriate for a given instructional situation. If, for example, the instructional activity consists of experiencing and discussing a series of specific Renaissance paintings, a set of slides and slide projector may be all the technology needed. On the other hand, an effective Internet-based course in physics will require development and support of a variety of materials, from Web pages to multimedia presentations. To accomplish this, faculty of the future (and today) should be able to assume the following obligations, some of which already are commonly accepted.

Subject matter expert This is a basic obligation currently and will not change in the future. Most faculty of today probably already have accepted the fact that they cannot know everything about their subjects. Thus, it will become more important not only to know the subject as well as possible but also know how to use technology-based information tools to keep oneself up-to-date and to teach students to use those tools.

Curriculum developer and designer Faculty currently develop curriculum but they also must be able to design curriculum and courses of study to meet specific student needs which may not be bound by rigid instructional times or places. Curriculum design also should be informed by available instructional technology. Technology generally has been seen as a way to enhance what is taught and/or afford different modes of instruction. However, it may be that what is taught also could be affected by the availability of certain technologies. For example, subject matter taught in drafting, machine technology, art, and office technology all have been profoundly changed by the availability of technologies in those subjects. The Bakersfield College drafting program can serve as a good example. Until 1982, the program exclusively used as its basic tools drafting machines and drafting boards, as did local business and industry. Working with local employers, the curriculum was virtually completely transformed to a computer assisted

drafting and design program over an approximately a two year period. This resulted in a profound transformation in both the subject matter and the method of instruction. The BC program had the additional outcome of hastening the movement to CADD by local employers.

Courseware designer Faculty need to be able to design course materials which can be used in a number of instructional settings and methods, including any or a combination of the Internet, video, computer-based systems, as well as in more traditional modes, such the lecture and laboratory. This is not mean that faculty must become experts in computer programming, designing Web pages, or multimedia development tools, however. Ideally, technical experts and instructional design specialists will be available to provide such services. Faculty should be responsible for pedagogical design and subject matter content, working with the technical consultants as materials are developed.

Instructional resource manager A faculty member should be expert in the use of instructional resources in her/his discipline. Again, they need not be technical experts. However, they must be current on what technologies and pedagogical approaches are available and how they are being used or could be used to help students become more effective learners.

Learning systems manager A community college faculty member today might be teaching a course using lectures with multimedia, an open entry/open exit laboratory course, an Internet course, a two-way video distance education course, and an independent study course for a few advanced students. Clearly, this person must not only be a fine traditional teacher but also a manager of multiple learning systems. This includes activities such as providing instruction and assistance at a distance, arranging for effective evaluation of student progress, making certain that students receive course materials needed, and managing the whole enterprise.

Staff development The learning curve can be steep when new technology or innovative

instructional approaches are adopted and initially used. Faculty undertaking such tasks must engage in staff development activities in order to become competent in the use of the tools and new instructional methods involved. In addition, an expectation should exist that faculty who engage in such pioneering work take responsibility for training and assisting their colleagues in order to increase the rate and extent of these adoptions.

Teacher Above all, the faculty member must be an effective teacher, but the nature of the traditional obligations of a teacher is changing. Not only must the instructor assume the obligations listed above, he/she is increasingly asked to take responsibility for student learning, rather than simply put in classroom time. As costs as well as demand for higher education increase, productivity in the form of greater emphasis on student learning is becoming more important (Johnstone, 1992). Currently the number of classroom hours is used as the primary basis for determining both student and faculty workload. As we increase our use of such technologies as the Internet for the delivery of instruction and base our student evaluations on what students learn at their own pace rather than within a semester or quarter, the nature of faculty assignments and associated obligations may change, too. Rather than being required to hold classes for specified periods of time, it may be necessary to assign faculty using other criteria. Under this model, the faculty member remains a teacher but in addition is more than ever a manager of student learning, with an obligation shift emphasis from numbers of student classroom hours to responsibility for subject matter mastery by students.

Some Barriers to Change

{I ASSUME KAMALA WILL INSERT THIS - INSERT B}

Faculty Assignments and Compensation

As faculty roles change, it is reasonable that the basis upon which they are compensated would change, too. For full time faculty, this really means that the way their "teaching loads," or, as used in the example below, "assignment credits," are calculated would be

modified. One virtue of the traditional system is that it is easy to calculate faculty workload and determine (in a gross manner, anyway) whether they were meeting their teaching and other obligations. Thus, a typical assignment might consist of a given number of hours per week spent in certain defined tasks, such as teaching, counseling/advising, and committee work. If faculty workloads are to be based on student outcomes rather than number of hours in class, and faculty are considered not only teachers but also instructional designers and managers, new criteria must be developed in order to determine what a full time assignment is. This is not a new idea. Faculty have been given non-teaching duty "release time" for many years. Such assignments sometimes are for short-term projects, but they also can be regular, permanent parts of an assignment. Considerations which might be used to determine faculty workloads might include the following.

Basic obligations and expectations. The first step must be an agreement on this fundamental matter. Some questions to be answered include:

- What is the number of "instructional units" or "assignment indices" in a full time teaching assignment?
- What other duties are part of the base assignment? For example, all faculty generally are expected to engage in curriculum development. But if a new program is to be created from scratch by a faculty member, that person might be given some released time from teaching in order to complete the project in a reasonable amount of time. If faculty are expected to be courseware designers and learning systems managers, what degree and level of complexity are required as part of the base assignment?

Number of units of instruction. This sounds like the traditional basis for faculty assignments, and it does share some of its characteristics. However, we do not envision a "unit of instruction" as necessarily referring to a particular number of hours in class, nor

to the Carnagie unit. Rather, an "assignment index" might be determined, defined by the college as an instructional workload standard which calls for the delivery and evaluation of instruction to a given number of students and the accomplishment of a set of predetermined instructional outcomes. It also would be necessary to consider other factors related to faculty time and effort, as outlined in the example below. Barr and Tagg even suggest using a productivity measure defined as "cost per unit of learning per student" (Barr and Tagg, 1995). For actual course "sections" the unit of instruction or productivity level could be modified when appropriate, as, for example, when the number of (successful) students is above a determined level. Note that no particular number of class hours would necessarily be required of either the student or the instructor. Rather, the prime measure of accountability would be on learning outcomes.

Difficulty of preparations If the subject matter and/or technology involved in an assignment are particularly challenging, greater workload credit might be warranted.

Leadership Since faculty often will be working in groups when developing curriculum and courseware and, in many cases, presenting courses, one person may take primary responsibility for the project. Usually that requires extra effort, which could be recognized in the assignment process.

New technology adoption This may require extra effort, particularly if the faculty member(s) pioneering such adoption have the obligation to train their colleagues. For example, if a college is embarking on a series of new courses employing two-way video/audio distance education, faculty members assigned to this project should receive assigned time credit, not only for the additional effort required in the launch of the new program but for the inevitable expectation that they will assist in training their colleagues.

Number of remote sites for two-way distance education The greater the number of sites, the greater the complexity and time required for instructional management, both during and outside of class time. During the class, the instructor must make certain that all

students at all sites feel part of the class, particularly during discussions, have a chance to ask (and be asked) questions, and receive needed information, including printed materials. Arrangements must be made for communication among students and with the instructor ("office hours") between classes, too. This can consist of E-mail, telephone contact, fax, ISDN links, and, of course, in-person contacts. Sometimes it is also necessary to arrange study, discussion, or examination sessions, to be held *via* television and/or in person at one or more instructional centers.

One-way distance education (telecourse) management Although the necessity of simultaneous instruction to a number of remote sites does not exist here as it does for two-way distance education, the other issues are just as important. Indeed, the instructor must be even more attentive to maintaining good communication because he/she does not see or communicate with the students during class. The instructor also may wish to create video materials that personalize and update the telecourse. These can be shown before, after, and even in between sections of the canned materials. They can even substitute for some of those materials.

Responsibility for physical resources If the faculty member has this responsibility at a level which requires coordination or management duties in excess of that normally expected, assignment credit could be warranted.

Number of students in a single class or in the total assignment. Depending on the method of instruction, the total number of students for which an instructor assumes responsibility can be a significant factor in his/her workload. If in addition, the instructor takes on the responsibility for the instructional outcomes of a given number of students, that number can and should be a factor in determining the assignment.

Course Management Some instructional assignments may involve responsibilities such as management of multiple learning centers and associated personnel.

Type of assignment Traditional teaching is unlikely to disappear any time soon. Some

faculty may be better suited to such teaching or simply prefer it. If, as a result, those faculty are given less responsibility in areas such as curriculum design and instructional management, their teaching assignments might be adjusted to compensate for this. Similarly, other faculty might have greater responsibility in, for example, instructional technology applications to their disciplines and have smaller teaching assignments.

We do not suggest that determining faculty assignments using the above and/or other criteria would be an easy matter, but it can and must be done if we are to take full advantage of the potential of new technologies. It will require considerable judgment, trust, and good will among all concerned. To achieve optimum equity it would be well to define in advance a "catalog" of project and assignment types and associated levels of difficulty. The following example illustrates some of these points. The "assignment indices" cited would be found in such a catalog.

An Example System

The following is offered as an example of the kind of faculty assignment system that considers the issues discussed above. It is neither a complete system nor a recipe for one. Rather, it can be seen as a starting point for the development of **such** a system.

Assignment Index

An *assignment index* is established for each activity for which the faculty member is responsible. Factors included in determining the value of this index would be time required for instructional delivery (however accomplished), preparation, level of intensity in working with students (including office hours, communication using listservs, E-mail, and other methods of communication), evaluation of student work in terms of quantity and intensity, and activities outside of the college (such as working with vocational/occupational advisory committees). Although student services assignments such as counseling are not being addressed here, such assignments could be defined in a

corresponding manner. The value of the index would range up to 1.00 FTE (full time equivalent), corresponding to a 100% assignment in that activity. The result of these determinations would be the "catalog" mentioned previously.

The establishment of assignment indices probably would be most effectively accomplished by a faculty/administrative committee similar to a curriculum committee. It would not be a simple task but the process itself would be very valuable in that it would require an in-depth examination of instructional activities and learning outcomes. Since assignment (or "load") values already are established for existing courses, those could be a starting point for the new assignment indices. A typical "course" might have an assignment index of .200, corresponding to 20% of a full assignment.

Index Factors

These allow for additional considerations that affect an assignment. For example if a faculty member is expected to develop new technological applications in order to improve the learning outcomes of students for whom he/she is responsible, a factor can be applied to the assignment index to provide compensation for the additional time and effort required. The factors that apply to an assignment are summed, and 1.00 is added to the total to produce a combined factor. Thus, if the assignment index were .200 FTE and an index factor had the value of .500, the resulting course credit would be .200 FTE x 1.500 = .300 FTE.

Preparation: Although preparation at a given level is assumed as part of the assignment factor, this provides for unusual preparation required for a particular situation or assignment type. *Example range: 1.25 - 2.00*

Technology development: Increasingly faculty are expected to develop and use new technology. Depending on the extent to which they are responsible for the actual development, additional assignment credit may be warranted. *Example range: 1.25 - 2.00*

Remote sites served: When offering two-way interactive classes, the demands on the

instructor become substantially greater as the number of remote sites served increases. Compensation for this greater level of difficulty can be recognized here or as an aspect of increased responsibility for course management, below. *Suggested range: 1.25 - 2.00*

Physical resources: Responsibility for physical resources, such as laboratories, equipment, and safety should be a consideration when it is not part of the assignment index. *Example range: 1.25 - 1.50*

Students served: When the number of successful students in a course or learning situation exceeds that which is normally expected, an additional factor may be indicated. We suggest that this arrangement be based on a clear, preferably written, agreement. Because we cannot know the number of "successful" students until the course is completed, any additional credit might be granted either at the end of the course or based on previous experience for that instructor. *Example range: 1.25 - 2.00*

Course management: This applies when the assignment involves considerable management of various aspects of a course or the overall assignment. Examples of such aspects: technological resources, numbers of students, instructional centers, learning resources, and a large number of courses for which the faculty member has responsibility. *Example range: 1.25 - 1.50*

Type of assignment: This includes other factors which may be important but which are not otherwise considered. *Example range: 1.25 - 1.50*

Example applications

The following example applications demonstrate how this system might work in practice. All of the faculty assignments apply to the Theoretical Endeavors Department of San Emedio Community College.

Example 1 (Table 1) Theoretical Endeavors 23 (ThEn 23) involves responsibility for the Theoretical Endeavors laboratory. Dr. Smart must deal with the maintenance and management of the complex and expensive equipment involved as well as the safety

aspects of the lab (high voltages and radioactivity). He also has agreed to accept the responsibility for the successful learning of 100 students, which is above the normal expectation of only 35 students. ThEn 35 is to be taught using interactive television for the first time, requiring the development of additional materials, including the use of multimedia modules. Because teaching the course involves working with three remote sites and a local classroom simultaneously, preparation is very elaborate and additionally involves managing the learning resources in those remote centers. Dr. Smart also serves as the distance education coordinator for the Theoretical Endeavors Department. He receives additional assignment credit for all of these duties and/or responsibilities.

Example 2 (Table 2) ThEn 1 is taught on the Internet to a large number of students, and the instructor, Dr. Henrietta Weiskopf, has accepted responsibility for their learning. The 374 students enrolled is in excess of the standard expectation of 125 students. Thus, she receives additional course credit for this assignment. The major portion of her assignment is as the learning community coordinator for the department. She works with159 students who she assists in establishing their own learning communities, and who are working on independent study projects, engaging in internships with local corporations, taking courses on the Internet, and, in some cases, taking traditional courses. She engages in advising, educational and occupational planning, works with other faculty, instructional aides, and technical staff, and with students completing independent learning contracts. She assists students in selecting independent study modules and monitors student progress. Her duties include helping both students and professors design effective technological and other solutions to learning situations. Dr. Weiskopf also teaches ThEn 49, in which she communicates with her students using E-mail and maintains a course listserv. These are considered to be standard tools for which no additional course credit is warranted. Finally, Dr. Weiskopf, known as a fine grant writer, has agreed to prepare the college's CALWORKs III funding plan for submission

to the California Community Colleges Sacramento office. Since this project is not considered to part of her regular duties, she will receive additional monetary compensation for it.

References

Table 1

Albright, M.J. *Instructional technology and higher education: rewards, rightrs, and responsibilities.* Keynote address presented to the Southern Regional Faculty and Instructional Development Consortium, Baton Rouge, LA, Feb. 5, 1996. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 392 412), 1996.

Name: Di Hank Street
Department: Theoretical Endeavors
Assignment: Fall 1999

Course	Assignment index	Assign. Credit (FTE)	Preparation	Tech Dev	Remote	Factor Resources	Students
ThEn 25							

Barr, R.B. and J. Tagg. *From teaching to learning: A new paradigm for undergraduate education.* **Change**, 27(6), 13-25, 1995.

Beaudoin, Michael. *The instructor's changing role in distance education.* **American Journal of Distance Education**, 4(2), 21-29, 1990.

Hammond, N., *et al. Blocks to the use of information technology in higher education.* **Computers and Education**, 18(1), 155-162, 1992.

Johnstone, D.B. *Learning productivity: A new imperative for American higher education.* Edited version of a monograph published by the State University of New York as part of a series, **Studies in Public Higher Education**, 1992, http://www.educom.edu/program/nlii/articles/johnstone.html.

McFarland, John . *It is of machinery and the American that we sing.* http://204.212.103/facccts/kaz_896.htm.

O'Banion, Terry. (1997). *A Learning College for the 21st Century. Phoenix: American Council on Education and the Onyx Press*, 1997.

O'Banion, Terry. *The Learning Revolution: A Guide for Community College Trustees,* **Trustee Quarterly**, Issue 1, 1997.

Olcott, D., and S.J. Wright. *An Institutional Framework for Increasing Faculty Participation in Postsecondary Distance Education.* **American Journal of Distance Education,** 9(3), 5-17, 1995..

20 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

We do not suggest that determining faculty assignments using the above and/or other criteria would be an easy matter, but it can and must be done if we are to take full advantage of the potential of new technologies. It will require considerable judgment, trust, and good will among all concerned. To achieve optimum equity it would be well to define in advance a "catalog" of project and assignment types and associated levels of difficulty. The following example illustrates some of these points. The "assignment indices" cited below might be found in such a catalog.

An Example System

The following is offered as an example of the kind of faculty assignment system, which considers the issues, discussed above. It is neither a complete system nor a recipe for one. Rather, it can be seen as a starting point for the development of **such** a system.

Assignment Index

An *assignment index* is established for each activity for which the faculty member is responsible. Factors included in determining the value of this index would be time required for instructional delivery (however accomplished), preparation, level of intensity in working with students (including office hours, communication using listservs, E-mail, and other methods of communication), evaluation of student work in terms of quantity and intensity, and activities outside of the college (such as working with vocational/occupational advisory committees). Although student services assignments such as counseling are not being addressed here, such assignments could be defined in a corresponding manner. The value of the index would range up to 1.00 FTE (full time equivalent), corresponding to a 100% assignment in that activity. The result of these determinations would be the "catalog" mentioned previously.

The establishment of assignment indices probably would be most effectively accomplished by a faculty/administrative committee similar to a curriculum committee. It

would not be a simple task but the process itself would be very valuable in that it would require an in-depth examination of instructional activities and learning outcomes. Since assignment (or "load") values already are established for existing courses, they could be a starting point for the new assignment indices. A typical "course" might have an assignment index of .200, corresponding to 20% of a full assignment.

Index Factors

These allow for additional considerations which affect an assignment. For example if a faculty member is expected to develop new technological applications in order to improve the learning outcomes of students for whom he/she is responsible, a factor can be applied to the assignment index to provide compensation for the additional time and effort required. The factors which apply to an assignment are summed, and 1.00 is added to the total to produce a combined factor. Thus, if the assignment index were .200 FTE and an index factor had the value of .500, the resulting course credit would be .200 FTE x 1.500 = .300 FTE.

Preparation: Although preparation at a given level is assumed as part of the assignment factor, this provides for unusual preparation required for a particular situation or assignment type. *Example range: 1.25 - 2.00*

Technology development: Increasingly faculty are expected to develop and use new technology. Depending on the extent to which they are responsible for the actual development, additional assignment credit may be warranted. *Example range: 1.25 - 2.00*

Remote sites served: When offering two-way interactive classes, the demands on the instructor become substantially greater as the number of remote sites served increases. Compensation for this greater level of difficulty can be recognized here or as an aspect of increased responsibility for course management, below. *Suggested range: 1.25 - 2.00*

Physical resources: Responsibility for physical resources, such as laboratories, equipment, and safety should be a consideration when it is not part of the assignment index. *Example range: 1.25 - 1.50*

Students served: When the number of successful students in a course or learning situation exceeds that which is normally expected, an additional factor may be indicated. We suggest that this arrangement be based on a clear, preferably written, agreement. Because we cannot know the number of "successful" students until the course is completed, any additional credit might be granted either at the end of the course or based on previous experience for that instructor. *Example range: 1.25 - 2.00*

Course management: This applies when the assignment involves considerable management of various aspects of a course or the overall assignment. Examples of such aspects: technological resources, numbers of students, instructional centers, learning resources, and a large number of courses for which the faculty member has responsibility. *Example range: 1.25 - 1.50*

Type of assignment: This includes other factors which may be important but which are not otherwise considered. *Example range: 1.25 - 1.50*

Example applications

The following example applications demonstrate how this system might work in practice. All of the faculty assignments apply to the Theoretical Endeavors Department of San Emedio Community College.

Example 1 (Table 1) Theoretical Endeavors 23 (ThEn 23) involves responsibility for the Theoretical Endeavors laboratory. Dr. Smart must deal with the maintenance and management of the complex and expensive equipment involved as well as the safety aspects of the lab (high voltages and radioactivity). He also has agreed to accept the responsibility for the successful learning of 100 students, which is above the normal expectation of only 35 students. ThEn 35 is to be taught using interactive television for the first time, requiring the development of additional materials, including the use of multimedia modules. Because teaching the course involves working with three remote sites and a local classroom simultaneously, preparation is very elaborate and additionally involves managing the learning resources in those remote centers. Dr. Smart also serves

as the distance education coordinator for the Theoretical Endeavors Department. He receives additional assignment credit for all of these duties and/or responsibilities.

Example 2 (Table 2) ThEn 1 is taught on the Internet to a large number of students, and the instructor, Dr. Henrietta Weiskopf, has accepted responsibility for their learning. The 374 students enrolled is in excess of the standard expectation of 125 students. Thus, she receives additional course credit for this assignment. The major portion of her assignment is as the learning community coordinator for the department. She works with159 students who she assists in establishing their own learning communities, and who are working on independent study projects, engaging in internships with local corporations, taking courses on the Internet, and, in some cases, taking traditional courses. She engages in advising, educational and occupational planning, works with other faculty, instructional aides, and technical staff, and with students completing independent learning contracts. She assists students in selecting independent study modules and monitors student progress. Her duties include helping both students and professors design effective technological and other solutions to learning situations. Dr. Weiskopf also teaches ThEn 49, in which she communicates with her students using E-mail and maintains a course listserv. These are considered to be standard tools for which no additional course credit is warranted. Finally, Dr. Weiskopf, known as a fine grant writer, has agreed to prepare the college's CALWORKs III funding plan for submission to the California Community Colleges Sacramento office. Since this project is not considered to part of her regular duties, she will receive additional monetary compensation for it.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 1

Name: Dr. Hank Smart									
Department: Theoretical Endeavors									
Assignment: Fall 1999									
								Factor	
		Assign. Credit (FTE)		**Preparation**	**Tech Dev**	**Remote**	**Resources**	**Students**	
Course	ThEn 23								
Assignment index		0.200					0.250	0.250	
Combined factors		1.500							
Total course credit			0.300						
Course	ThEn 35								
Assignment index		0.300		0.250	0.500				
Combined factors		2.000							
Total course credit			0.600						
Activity	**DE Coord.**		0.100						
Total assignment			1.000						

Notes:

Course/Assignment	**Factor**	**Explanation**
ThEn 23	Resources	Laboratory equipment and safety
	Students	Learning agreement for 100 students
ThEn 35	Preparation	Four - site simultaneous responsibility
	Tech Dev	Development of multimedia applications on interactive television
	Management	Managing learning resources in three remote centers
Distance Education Coordination		Serve as distance education coordinator for Theoretical Endeavors Dept

Table 2

Name: Dr. Henrietta Weiskopf								
Department: Theoretical Endeavors								
Assignment: Fall 1999								
				Factor				
		Assign. Credit (FTE)		**Preparation**	**Tech Dev**	**Remote**	**Resources**	**Students**
Course	ThEn 1							
Assignment index		0.067						0.500
Combined factors		1.500						
Total course credit			0.100					
Course	ThEn 49							
Assignment index		0.100						
Combined factors		1.000						
Total course credit			0.100					
Activity	**Lng Comm Coord**		0.800					
Total assignment			1.000					

Notes

Course/assignment	**Factor**	**Explanation**
ThEn 1	Students	374 students in Internet course
Learning community Coordinator		Serve as learning community coordinator for the Theoretical Endeavors Dept.

Additional assignment

Description

Preparation of CalWORKs III funding plan for San Emedio College

Compensation

Stipend: $1500